

PATENT  
10/047,116

REMARKS

Telephone Interview with Examiner on October 27, 2004.

Applicants thank Examiner for the telephone interview extended to their attorney, J. B. Kraft on October 27, 2004. As Applicants explained in that interview, the claims have been amended to emphasize what is the key to the present invention. As will be described in the argument below, the amendment has modified the scope of the claims to a status wherein they set forth an element not disclosed in the Rust patent. Thus, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection over Rust is no longer applicable. Accordingly, Applicants will hereinafter establish why the claims as amended are unobvious under 35 USC 103(a) over Rust combined with Gupta et al.

**Applicants Argument.**

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1-3, 7, 11-13, 17, 19-21, and 25 as amended are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Rust (US6,535,909); and all of the claims (1-28) are unobvious under 35 USC 103(a) over Rust in view of Gupta et al. (US6,546,405).

Both the present invention and the basic Rust reference are directed to fully recording Web browsing sessions including Web navigation and the sequential accessing of other Web documents through hyperlinks. According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may be played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different pace.

However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent

AUS920010907US1

11

PATENT  
10/047,116

user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

This is described in the specification of the present application wherein the hyperlinks "Kuwaiti Girls School" 67, in the Web page shown in Fig. 11, and "F. Five Chemical Alerts..." 71, in the Web page shown in Fig. 10 are never clicked on or selected in the original browsing session but rather the hyperlinks are saved in the "Later Link Log" 75, Fig. 13. Then, during the play back of the original recorded browser session described with respect to Fig 16, the subsequent play back user may choose, step 117, to stop the play back and click on one of the saved but unselected hyperlinks to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching of such an interactive original selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded Web browsing session. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 11-13, 17, 19-21, and 25 as amended over Rust under 35 USC 102 is not sustainable. A rejection under 35 USC 102 requires that the reference expressly or impliedly disclose every element of the claimed combination. This Rust now fails to do.

The Gupta et al. reference does not make up for this fundamental deficiency of Rust as a reference so as to render the claims obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Gupta relates to the production and recording of multimedia presentations in which content is accessed through networks. The Examiner relies on Gupta to show that it would be obvious to include timelines and like marks or indicators for such purposes in recording and playback of browsing sessions. Thus, claims 4-6, 8-10, 14-161, 18, 22-24, and 26-28 are rejected as being obvious over the combination of Rust in view of Gupta. Applicants will concede that Gupta does teach the use of various time lines or like markings in

AUS920010907US1

12

PATENT  
10/047,116

network multimedia presentations. But it is submitted that Gupta like Rust does not have any suggestion of Applicants' invention element wherein hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-28 as amended are now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

*J. B. Kraft* 11/03/04  
J. B. Kraft  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 19,226  
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker  
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054  
IBM Corporation  
11400 Burnet Road  
Austin, Texas 78758

AUS920010907US1

13

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**